## **EXHIBIT 261**

[	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	CASE NUMBER: 22-CV-10904-JSR
4	ACTION FOR DAMAGES
5	COMPRIMENT OF THE INTERPRETATION (
6	GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ) VIRGIN ISLANDS, )
7	Plaintiff, )
8	VS. )
9	JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.,
10	Defendant. )
11	)
12	
13	
14	
15	VIDEO RECORDED DEPOSITION OF
16	SHANI A. PINNEY
17	30(B)(6) WITNESS
18	TUESDAY, JULY 18, 2023
19	
20	
21	REPORTED BY:
22	DENISE D. HARPER-FORDE
23	Certified Shorthand Reporter (CSR) Certified RealTime Reporter (CRR)
24	Certified LiveNote Reporter (CLR) Registered Professional Reporter (RPR)
25	Notary Public (FLORIDA)



1	door." Did we want to do it that
2	way? No.
3	You know, we would have loved
4	to. And it was actually, you know
5	like I said, we would love to
6	be able to go into the home of
7	every offender, including Epstein,
8	when when he was registering.
9	But we came to the you
10	know, the decision that his dock
11	had to essentially be considered
12	as his as his front door.
13	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
14	Q. Why weren't you on the Friday
15	call with Ms. Carbon?
16	A. Oh, I've been on family
17	vacation. I just came back yesterday
18	evening. I've been gone since July
19	5th. So I wasn't available for the
20	call on Friday. Actually Ms the
21	E-mail invite for for that
22	meeting.
23	Q. Okay. So you were invited to
24	the meeting by your counsel, but you
25	didn't see the invite, and so didn't



1	attend?
2	A. I wasn't able to I didn't
3	see the invite. So I wasn't able to
4	attend.
5	Q. Okay. And so your counsel
6	took notes of the meeting and provided
7	them to you?
8	A. I guess this goes back to who
9	actually prepared this document. I'm
10	not sure. But this was provided to me
11	Attorney Ackerman.
12	And it was a and it is a
13	brief write-up of the meeting on
14	Friday with with Attorney Carbon.
15	Q. How much time did you spend
16	going over this document, prior to the
17	deposition this morning?
18	A. We met for about a half hour
19	yesterday, and then I received the
20	document afterwards. Had a long day
21	of traveling. I reviewed for about
22	five, ten minutes yesterday evening
23	after after our meeting last
24	night.
25	Q. Did you ask any follow-up



1	that he based that based on what was
2	presented to him about Jeffrey
3	Epstein.
4	I want to think he never met
5	with Epstein in regards to, you know,
6	prior to making that decision. I want
7	to think that paperwork or documents
8	were provided to him from Epstein's
9	attorneys to show that he was a
LO	business man, a financial advisor,
L1	financial business man who had to
L2	travel frequently.
L3	Q. So you said you want to think
L <b>4</b>	that that's the answer.
L5	A. If I want to remember
L6	correctly from that meeting, that is
L7	what was discussed or that was what
L8	was related from Attorney Frazer.
L9	Q. Okay. So Attorney Frazer told
20	you that he was provided with
21	documents by Epstein's counsel
22	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object.
23	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
24	Q and that's what he based
25	the determination that he was a



1	business man on, which was then also
2	the reason for granting the waiver; is
3	that correct?
4	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
5	form.
6	THE WITNESS: Okay. So he
7	never I remember him saying
8	that he never met with Epstein
9	individually, but he did meet with
10	Epstein's attorneys.
11	I'm not sure if during those
12	meetings that they provided
13	documents. But prior or after
14	his meeting with Epstein's
15	attorneys, he was satisfied
16	enough, you know, to conclude that
17	Epstein was a business man and he
18	granted him that permission.
19	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
20	Q. Okay. So he was satisfied
21	after a meeting with his attorneys,
22	but you don't actually know what he
23	was provided to support the business
24	man conclusion?
25	A. I'm not 100 percent sure what



1 he was providing. No, I'm not. 2 Okay. And that didn't come up with your -- in your conversation with 3 4 Mr. Frazer? 5 Α. Overall what I remember is 6 that he never met with Epstein. 7 when he met with his attorneys and 8 upon his review of Epstein and his 9 businesses, he felt confidence that he 10 was a business man who had to travel 11 frequently. What other topics were covered 12 Ο. 13 in your meeting with Mr. Frazer? 14 It was primarily that, you 15 know, since he was the AG who was 16 there when Epstein first began 17 registering and he was the first AG to 18 use his discretion, it was primarily 19 -- it was primarily based on that. 20 Ο. So it was primarily that. 21 what other topics were covered? 2.2 ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to 23 form, asked and answered. 24 THE WITNESS: If I remember it 25 correctly, that was it. Nothing



1	You know, so by by enhancing our
2	laws in 2012, that made us eligible to
3	us being the Virgin Islands
4	eligible to receive funding for
5	employees to to monitor offenders
6	in the Virgin Islands.
7	Q. Was that funding adequate to
8	do the job that you guys had to do?
9	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
10	form, scope.
11	THE WITNESS: If it was the
12	pos that funding was used for
13	salaries. Other and funding
14	was also received from US Marshals
15	Services as well too, you know, to
16	purchase like iPads, you know, for
17	us to use to be able to monitor
18	offenders outside of the office.
19	You know, to be able to update the
20	registry, the online registry
21	outside the office as well too.
22	So from from V from US
23	DoJ, that funding was used for
24	salaries, the salaries being, you
25	know, for the three positions.



1	And then VI DoJ also the
2	funding was also used to purchase
3	a SORNA vehicle as well too.
4	So, you know, that vehicle was
5	used to do com was used to do
6	compliance checks, one for St.
7	Thomas and one for St. Croix.
8	So I would say yes, that that
9	funding was able to allow us to
10	to allow DoJ to hire adequate
11	staff and then to also to purchase
12	vehicles to go out to do the
13	address verifications for the
14	offenders.
15	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
16	Q. So US DoJ wasn't constrained
17	by resources in its monitoring of
18	offenders, correct?
19	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
20	form, scope, misstates prior
21	testimony.
22	THE WITNESS: No.
23	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
24	Q. No, it wasn't constrained or
25	no, you disagree?



1	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Same
2	objection.
3	THE WITNESS: Repeat the
4	question for me, please. You're
5	saying if funding constraints VI
6	DoJ from perform from
7	adequately monitoring offenders in
8	the Virgin Islands?
9	ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN: Yes.
10	THE WITNESS: And to that
11	question, I would say no, that we
12	were able to monitor the offenders
13	that were here in the Virgin
14	Islands.
15	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
16	Q. Okay. So resource constraints
17	did not limit VI DoJ's ability to
18	monitor the individuals who were
19	registered with it?
20	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Objection
21	to form. Misstates prior
22	testimony, and scope.
23	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN)
24	Q. Correct?
25	A. We were not limited, no.



1	Q. Okay. In any way?
2	A. In any way.
3	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Same
4	objection.
5	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
6	Q. Okay. When did DoJ first
7	become aware of Jeffrey Epstein?
8	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Objection
9	to form, scope.
10	THE WITNESS: VI DoJ first
11	became aware of Epstein, that
12	would have been before I came on.
13	But like any offender, once they
14	notify DoJ that they that they
15	are moving here or working here.
16	So I will assume that and
17	also from the from the
18	documents that that they were
19	first notified of Epstein when he
20	was living here in the Virgin
21	Islands.
22	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
23	Q. So was it when he was just
24	when he was living here or when he
25	registered as a sex offender?



1	investigation can only be launched
2	if someone launches if someone
3	files a criminal Complaint. I'm
4	understanding that to be a
5	Complaint being filed locally, you
6	know, with VI DoJ or you know,
7	with VIPD.
8	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
9	Q. Why does it need to be a
10	locally filed Complaint?
11	A. I'm saying that's what I
12	understand and
13	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Hold on.
14	Objection, scope. You can go
15	ahead.
16	THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm saying
17	that's what I understand, you
18	know, the AG's meaning to be here
19	in this sentence. Nothing was
20	ever filed directly with VI DoJ or
21	VIPD to launch an investigation.
22	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
23	Q. And DoJ's position is that
24	unless something was filed directly
25	with them, there was no need to do any



1	kind of investigation into Epstein?
2	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Objection
3	to form, scope.
4	THE WITNESS: Yeah. You know,
5	it cannot be a no hearsay. It
6	cannot be rumors, whispers. It
7	has to actually be someone
8	actually filing a Complaint.
9	That would have been the
10	means, you know, for any sexual
11	offender to start spark an
12	investigation or you know, if
13	information was shared directly,
14	you know, with the victim you know
15	to VI DoJ. It would have to have
16	been dir it would have had to
17	have been direct communication.
18	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
19	Q. Did anyone within DoJ ever
20	push for more to be done with respect
21	to investigating Epstein?
22	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Objection
23	to form, scope.
24	THE WITNESS: No.
25	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):



July 18, 2023 222

disposition, it wasn't easy for me to 1 2 get information, to get that basic 3 information. So I'm not sure if I had 4 5 reached out for this sort of information, if it would have been, 6 7 you know, granted to VI DoJ. 8 really cannot say. I'm not sure what 9 lengths EDA went to get this 10 information. I'm not sure. 11 (BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN): 12 Okay. Ο. There's -- if you keep 13 flipping, page 31 in the document, there's a section of the investigation 14 15 that says "Online media search: 16 Jeffrey Epstein." Uh-huh. 17 Α. 18 And the summary says, "The Ο. 19 investigation revealed numerous online 20 negative references to Jeffrey Edward 21 Epstein, but the following two 2.2 negative online sources provided 23 current" substantive -- "substantive 24 overview of the nature of those 25 reports."



1	Is there any reason that DoJ
2	could not have run searches to look at
3	public media reports?
4	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Objection
5	to form, scope, foundation.
6	THE WITNESS: If there's any
7	reason why VI DoJ could not have
8	conducted this same search and got
9	this same information? Any one can do
10	a search.
11	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
12	Q. Okay.
13	A. If it's if it's leaning
14	Q. Oh, sorry.
15	A. I'm sorry.
16	Q. No. I didn't
17	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Finish
18	your answer, please.
19	THE WITNESS: I was going to
20	say if it's leaning into a Yahoo or a
21	Google search would have been enough
22	to trump an investigation, I still
23	I can't say that would have been
24	enough. I don't think that that would
25	have been enough.



1	Q. And it's dated June 30th,
2	2008, correct?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. So earlier when you testified
5	that USVI DoJ made a request to
6	Florida for certain information about
7	the underlying criminal case, was
8	were these the documents that came
9	back?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Okay. And what did you learn
12	from these documents?
13	A. We learned what we learned
14	what he was found guilty of, the
15	crime.
16	Q. And what crime was that?
17	A. Procuring person under 18 for
18	prostitution.
19	Q. Is that a serious crime?
20	A. I would say all sexual
21	offenses are serious crimes regardless
22	of what tier they fall into.
23	Q. Are some more serious than
24	others?
25	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to



	I I
1	form.
2	THE WITNESS: According to the
3	statute, they determine which tier an
4	offense falls into. What I want to
5	say, more serious because I think all
6	offenses, all sexual offenses are all
7	serious alike.
8	But according to the victim's
9	age, according to if it was forcible
10	rape or, you know, statutory rape,
11	that will determine what tier it falls
12	into. So I don't want to say ser
13	I think, like I said before, all
14	offenses are serious.
15	But according to the details
16	of the case, the details of the
17	offense, you will see certain cases at
18	the higher tier levels.
19	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
20	Q. Is this one of those cases?
21	A. At a high
22	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
23	form.
24	THE WITNESS: Can you repeat
25	that, please?
l	



1	Q. Do you know if Epstein was
2	involved at all in the legislation in
3	2012?
4	A. No.
5	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
6	form, scope.
7	THE WITNESS: Repeat the
8	question, please.
9	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
10	Q. Do you know if Epstein was
11	involved at all in the passage of the
12	2012 legislation?
13	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
14	form, scope. You can answer.
15	THE WITNESS: No.
16	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
17	Q. Do you know whether drafts of
18	the legislation were provided to
19	Epstein?
20	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Same
21	objection. You can answer.
22	THE WITNESS: No.
23	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
24	Q. Do you know whether he
25	commented or expressed a view on what



1	the legislation ought to contain?
2	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Same
3	objection. You can answer.
4	THE WITNESS: No.
5	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
6	Q. Would you be surprised if
7	drafts were shared with him?
8	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Objection,
9	form, scope.
10	You can answer.
11	THE WITNESS: If I would be
12	surprised? Definitely.
13	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
14	Q. Why?
15	A. Because that was within DoJ.
16	That was something that we were
17	working on within DoJ. If it was
18	if it was shared with anyone outside
19	of DoJ, that would have been a
20	surprise to me.
21	Q. Would it have been
22	problematic?
23	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
24	form, scope.
25	THE WITNESS: If an offender



1	saw the draft that was being created
2	by VI DoJ for the sex offender
3	registration laws, if that would have
4	been problematic? I would say I
5	would say anyone seeing that draft
6	would would have been a problem
7	definitely.
8	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Good time
9	for a break? Whenever you're ready.
10	ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN: Sure.
11	Let's pause there.
12	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Okay.
13	VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record
14	at 3:26.
15	(Off the record)
16	(Back on the record)
17	VIDEOGRAPHER: On the record.
18	The time is 3:43 P.M.
19	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
20	Q. So we were looking at Exhibit
21	12 before we took a break. And I'd
22	like to refer you Bates 12263 within
23	Exhibit 12.
24	This is a letter dated July
25	25th, 2012, from Attorney General



1	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
2	Q. No you don't know or you don't
3	think they were?
4	A. If other offenders were
5	granted this, I would have been aware,
6	since I was registering the
7	offenders.
8	Q. Okay. And you're not aware of
9	any other offenders that got these
10	sorts of waivers?
11	A. No.
12	Q. Okay.
13	A. I do want to say though you
14	said if they if anyone ever made
15	requests. We got complaints all the
16	time, you know.
17	So offenders, you know,
18	complain about the frequency,
19	everything all the time. So it was
20	just wasn't to the extent, you know,
21	of this.
22	Q. What was the reason for the
23	original regime of having the 21-day
24	notice requirement?
25	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to



offense, correct? 1 2 I don't agree with the last part. Because I cannot say what it 3 4 was classified as, because it simply 5 wasn't just looking at the crime, the 6 title of the crime was also -- I 7 remember it was also looking at the 8 breakdown of the statute as well too, 9 where it detailed, you know, exactly, 10 you know, what that crime entailed. 11 Ο. So who within the USVI 12 Government knows the answer to the 13 question of why Jeffrey Epstein was 14 classified as a Tier 1 offender? 15 ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to 16 form. THE WITNESS: Who would know 17 18 why? 19 (BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN): 20 Yes. Ο. 21 Α. I am not sure. I remember 22 that we passed them on to attorneys, 23 namely Attorney Carbon. That --24 that's who we passed them on. I'm not 25 sure if she had an assistant who



1	assisted her in regards to the
2	classifications, another attorney who
3	assisted her.
4	Q. So you're not aware of any
5	person who would know the answer to
6	why the USVI Government classified
7	Epstein as Tier 1?
8	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
9	form.
10	THE WITNESS: No.
11	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
12	Q. Okay. Let's look at Bates
13	12283 within Exhibit 12.
14	A. Exhibit 12. Can you repeat
15	the page number, please?
16	Q. Yeah. It's 12283.
17	So this is a legal memorandum
18	to you from Darren Indyke, Epstein's
19	attorney, copying Monica Carbon, dated
20	September 6, 2012. And the subject is
21	"Jeffrey Epstein's qualification as a
22	Tier 1 sex offender."
23	Do you see that?
24	A. Yes, I do.
25	Q. If you look at the last



1	do not recall or having to request a
2	memorandum explaining why Epstein
3	would have been a Tier 1 offender,
4	according to his review.
5	Q. So your testimony today is
6	that do you recall asking for the
7	passports, the copies of the
8	passports?
9	A. I would have quicker asked for
10	that. That sounds more practical, you
11	know, because we needed to collect
12	from offenders all of their all of
13	their official IDs, you know.
14	So that was a part of what we
15	did for all offenders. I would have
16	needed his two passports.
17	Q. And so your testimony sitting
18	here today is that what you likely
19	requested from Mr. Epstein was copies
20	of the U.S. passports, and then they,
21	his counsel, voluntarily submitted a
22	memorandum regarding Mr. Epstein's
23	qualification as a Tier 1 offender?
24	A. They were very proactive. So
25	I'm saying that to say with all the



1	E-mails that, you know, is included,
2	yeah. I think they probably took it
3	upon themselves to review their the
4	laws on their own, and then to
5	determine on their own what they felt
6	Epstein's classification should have
7	been.
8	Q. So USVI DoJ never requested a
9	memorandum from Epstein's attorneys
10	regarding his classification as a Tier
11	1 offender?
12	A. I never did. And I don't
13	think anyone else from U.S from VI
14	DoJ requested that from Epstein's
15	attorneys.
16	Q. Do you know if the memorandum
17	sent on September 6, 2012, was
18	considered by USVI DoJ as part of its
19	determination of what tier to assign
20	to Jeffrey Epstein?
21	A. What page is that again,
22	please? I'm shuffling back and forth.
23	Q. 12283.
24	A. 12283. So backwards now. All
25	right.



1	A. I think they did that outside
2	of this memorandum from Indyke.
3	Q. Even though the E-mail says,
4	Here's the memo you requested?
5	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
6	form, misstates prior testimony.
7	THE WITNESS: To me, the
8	E-mail says, As requested, the two
9	U.S. passports. English is a very
10	funny language. I think that he just
11	threw that part in there. Not saying
12	that I requested a memorandum.
13	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
14	Q. Okay. And that's your
15	testimony here today?
16	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Objection.
17	Of course it's her testimony. I mean
18	
19	ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN: That's
20	not an objection.
21	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Okay.
22	Fine. Objection to form, improper
23	question.
24	THE WITNESS: Oh, yes, that's
25	a yes.



1	A. How frequent the sweeps occur?
2	There was no set-in-stone time for the
3	frequency of the sweeps to occur. It
4	would be something where we were in
5	constant communication with the US
6	Marshals Services. And they will let
7	us know, Hey, you know, this will be
8	the time for an upcoming sweep.
9	Q. Do you have an estimate of how
LO	frequently they occurred?
L1	A. I would say perhaps once a
L2	year depending on funding.
L3	Q. Okay. Funding from where?
L <b>4</b>	A. Funding that the US Marshals
L5	Services received. So the US Marshals
L6	is Federal funding to conduct the
L7	operational sweeps.
L8	Q. Okay. And during a sweep,
L9	what was the objective?
20	A. The objective was to verify
21	the address of the that the sex
22	offender had on record as their
23	permanent residence.
24	Q. What does verify mean?
25	A. Verify, verification process



July 18, 2023 407

follow-up. We would have -- we might 1 2 have circled back. Remember, so we went from Sunday to Sunday. If during 3 4 that -- if we went on Monday and we 5 weren't able to verify, we might 6 circle back because again, you know, 7 sometime during the days of the rest 8 of the week, yes, we would have. 9 Okay. And if you weren't able 10 to make contact during the sweep 11 week, would there be further 12 follow-up? 13 There would be further 14 follow-up. 15 ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to 16 form, scope. 17 You can answer. 18 THE WITNESS: Okay. So after 19 the -- so yes, we -- efforts would 20 have been made to follow up again. 21 you are speaking pertaining to Jeffrey 22 Epstein, that's a different scenario 23 because VI DoJ does not own a vessel. 24 And to confirm the address for 25 Epstein, US Marshals Services, they



July 18, 2023 408

1 would go about setting up, you know, 2 the necessary accommodations that -that would have been needed to go out 3 4 to Epstein's island. 5 So if there was an incident 6 where we attempted to complete a 7 compliance check with Epstein and he 8 was not on the island or he was not at 9 Let's say he was off island, 10 and that incident did happen at one time. 11 12 It wouldn't have -- it would 13 have not been easy to just simply get 14 another boat, you know, two days later 15 to go back to verify his address. 16 Q. Did you try? 17 Did we try? The US Marshals Α. Services, it was -- it was their 18 19 So if they tried afterwards, efforts. 2.0 US Marshals Services, they were --21 they were typically employed -- their 2.2 team came from Florida and from the 23 southern US. So they were here at a 24 time within a time frame. 25 So if they weren't able to



July 18, 2023 409

1 confirm with Epstein to complete his 2 compliance check within that time period, they would have tried. But 3 4 once they went back, that was it. know, the operation ended at that 5 6 point. 7 And there wouldn't have been Ο. 8 any further follow-up, correct? 9 Further follow-up in regards to verifying his address? 10 11 Ο. Yeah. 12 Well, if we go there and Α. 13 Epstein -- remember I said before 14 another person in the home can, you 15 know, confirm that the offender was 16 living there. Ideally we do want to 17 see the offender in person. 18 However, an offender not being 19 at the address does not -- does not 20 immediately mean that they are in 21 noncompliance or, you know, it -- it 22 wouldn't immediately mean they were in 23 noncompliance if -- within the team if 24 it was agreed that, okay, you know, 25 he's off island right now or, you



July 18, 2023 410

1 know, we can meet him at his office, 2 then that would have been enough to, you know, to -- at the time for, you 3 4 know, during the week of the checks. 5 Ο. You testified earlier that 6 USVI DoJ SOR unit purchased a car? 7 Α. Uh-huh. 8 Why? Ο. 9 I testified earlier that the 10 vehicle was used to conduct the verification checks --11 12 Ο. So --13 -- the compliance checks. 14 So the car was only used Ο. 15 approximately once a year? Remember I also said 16 17 that -- that during the year, we would 18 also verify the addresses of 19 offenders, you know, if they 2.0 relocated, if they had a new address. Within that time, I think it's seven 21 22 days, that we would also go out to 23 verify their addresses. 24 Were there any other reasons a 25 car would be used?



1	this these pictures or evidence.
2	ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN: Yes.
3	THE WITNESS: I never did, but
4	I did share this
5	E-mail with investigators and also
6	with the criminal defense attorney.
7	ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN: Let's
8	enter Tab 23 as Exhibit 23.
9	(Whereupon, Defendant's
10	Exhibit No. 23, E-mail, dated
11	February 25, 2019, was marked
12	for identification)
13	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
14	Q. This is an E-mail from you,
15	and it's a forward of the E-mail we
16	were just looking at to an Anola
17	Duncan, Quincy McRae, Carol Jacobs,
18	copying Kevin Augustin; correct?
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. Was this what you were just
21	talking about as when you passed
22	this information along?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Who are you to the people on
25	this distribution list?



1	A. Anola Duncan was the AG's
2	secretary. Quincy McRae was the
3	criminal the chief over the
4	criminal division. Carol Jacobs
5	Carol Jacobs, she I don't see
6	Denise in here.
7	So Carol must have been the
8	acting AG, and Kevin Augustin was the
9	Kevin Augustin was the investigator
10	for SORNA.
11	Q. Do you know what, if any,
12	follow-up they did in response to you
13	passing this information along?
14	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
15	form.
16	THE WITNESS: I am not sure if
17	anything was done, followed up. I'm
18	not sure if anything was done. It
19	I wasn't aware of it.
20	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
21	Q. Okay. So as far as you know,
22	you E-mailed it, but there was no
23	further follow-up?
24	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
25	form.



1	THE WITNESS: As far as I
2	know, nothing else was relayed back to
3	me about a follow-up to this E-mail.
4	(BY ATTORNEY O'LAUGHLIN):
5	Q. Okay. And did you follow up
6	with any of them to be like, Hey, what
7	happened with this?
8	ATTORNEY ACKERMAN: Object to
9	form.
10	THE WITNESS: There were other
11	follow-ups, but it was it was
12	pertaining to the same offender
13	sending threatening E-mails as well
14	too, referring to me as a monkey,
15	referring, you know you know, to us
16	being you know, very harsh
17	explicatives, you know, within the
18	E-mail.
19	So within this within this
20	this offender's file, there are
21	several other E-mails that he he
22	would send E-mails 3:00, 4:00 in the
23	morning. But, you know, nonetheless,
24	I still forwarded this E-mail on
25	because he spoke about him having



July 18, 2023 437

asked which works best for us. 1 But it 2 was the Marshals Service who would essentially, you know, decide which 3 dates were best. 4 5 Ο. Okay. And by the way, are the 6 address verifications the same thing 7 as the sweeps that you described, that 8 you -- it was a term you used 9 earlier? 10 Α. Yes. So the US Marshals 11 Services, they titled those. 12 called the operation as Operation 13 Island Sweep. 14 Okay. And when -- what is the 15 purpose of the sweep or the address 16 verification? 17 The purpose is to confirm that what the offender has provided as 18 19 their permanent residence, and also 2.0 instances may also be their employer 21 address, that that is true and -- and 2.2 correct. 23 Okay. When you performed or 24 when the DoJ performed sweeps to 25 verify Mr. Epstein's address, did DoJ



1	compliance because a search of their
2	home was not required to complete that
3	address verification.
4	Q. Okay. Thank you.
5	You testified earlier one of
6	the things you did in preparation for
7	this deposition was to review the
8	testimony of Inais Borque, right?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Okay. There was testimony in
11	Ms. Borque's deposition about
12	performing weekly checks of offenders.
13	Do you recall that testimony?
14	A. I do recall reading that in
15	her in her deposition, yes.
16	Q. Okay. Was it the practice of
17	the Virgin Islands DoJ SORNA office to
18	conduct weekly checks of sex offenders
19	during the time period that you worked
20	in that office?
21	A. No, it was not.
22	Q. Thank you.
23	I want to go through a few
24	exhibits, and I'll try to just go
25	quickly. But let's start with Exhibit



1	But do you know who the sex offender
2	is?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Okay. First let's look at the
5	bottom E-mail. What was the sex
6	offender demand or was the sex
7	offender demanding something from the
8	DoJ SORNA office?
9	A. He was demanding to be removed
10	from the registry.
11	Q. Okay. Was this a frequent
12	demand from this individual?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Did you consider this
15	individual's statements regarding
16	claiming to have audio and video of
17	things going on on Little St. James
18	credible?
19	A. I personally made the decision
20	to forward it on. If it was
21	creditable, it may have been, but the
22	offender was very questionable. He
23	was an habitual drug user, you know.
24	And a lot of his other E-mails would
25	come 3:00, 4:00, 2:00, 5:00 o'clock in
J	



1	the morning, and very belligerent, you
2	know, very broken up, very cut-up
3	language, you know. So anything can
4	be creditable. That's why I forwarded
5	it on, you know. But his as
6	an individual, he was very
7	questionable.
8	Q. Okay. Thank you. You can put
9	that aside.
10	There was a lot of discussion,
11	or there was some discussion today
12	about warrants. And I want to ask, in
13	your capacity in your work for the
14	SORNA unit, were you involved in
15	attempting to obtain warrants from
16	magistrate judges in the Virgin
17	Islands?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Describe just generally what
20	the nature of your involvement was.
21	A. It wasn't always easy to get
22	those warrants. That is why we
23	created that notification need to
24	register so it can be a clear document
25	that we attach along with the



1	Objection.
2	THE WITNESS: Directly, no.
3	The AG entrusted that the SORNA
4	that the SORNA employees and the
5	investigators, that we were doing
6	that. And of course, you know, we
7	will meet with her if need be.
8	(BY ATTORNEY ACKERMAN):
9	Q. Okay. A lot of discussion
LO	today about waiver of travel
L1	requirements. Do you recall that, all
L2	that testimony?
L3	A. Yes.
L <b>4</b>	Q. Are you aware of any other sex
L5	offender in the Virgin Islands who
L6	requested a more permanent waiver
L7	similar to what Mr. Epstein
L8	requested?
L9	A. To my knowledge, no.
20	Q. There was discussion about the
21	tiering, the tier classification of
22	Mr. Epstein, correct?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Okay. Does the tier class
25	under Virgin Islands law, does the

